

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF MISSISSIPPI
SOUTHERN DIVISION**

MADIE RUTH JACKSON

PLAINTIFF

v.

CAUSE NO. 1:17CV167-LG-RHW

BARACK OBAMA and JULIE THEATER

DEFENDANTS

ORDER DISMISSING ACTION AND SANCTIONING PLAINTIFF

This matter comes before the Court *sua sponte* for consideration of dismissal pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12 of the Complaint filed by *pro se* Plaintiff Madie Ruth Jackson and for consideration of instituting sanctions against Plaintiff for her repeated frivolous filings. For the reasons stated below, the Court will dismiss this action and sanction Plaintiff.

On June 29, 2017, the Court ordered Plaintiff to file an Amended Complaint that includes specific allegations and causes of action against each of the named defendants, or otherwise show cause why her current Complaint should not be dismissed. (*See* Order 2, ECF No. 3). The Court further stated that “[a]ny amendment or response must also clearly set forth the basis for the Court’s jurisdiction over this action. Otherwise, the Court will dismiss this action.” (*See id.*). On July 10, 2017, Plaintiff filed a [4] “Response to Order” in which she essentially re-stated her claims and again failed to set forth the basis for the Court’s jurisdiction.

The Court has reviewed the Complaint and Response, and liberally construed all allegations in favor of Plaintiff. As an initial matter, the Court is not convinced

that it has subject-matter jurisdiction. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(h)(3). Even so, after being provided an opportunity to remedy the issues with her original Complaint, Plaintiff still has not stated any viable claims against either Defendant. *See Ashcroft v. Iqbal*, 556 U.S. 662, 678 (2009). Therefore, the Court will dismiss this action. *See Carroll v. Fort James Corp.*, 470 F.3d 1171, 1177 (5th Cir. 2006).

As discussed in the previous [3] Order, Plaintiff's allegations in this action are nearly identical to those in two previously dismissed actions. (*See Jackson v. Obama, et al.*, No. 1:17cv97-HSO-JCG; *Jackson v. Obama, et al.*, No. 1:16cv379-HSO-JCG). Notably, another judge in this district has already cautioned Plaintiff against filing repetitive, frivolous filings of this sort. (*See* June 2, 2017 Order, ECF No. 8, at p.5, *Jackson v. Obama, et al.*, No. 1:17cv97-HSO-JCG). In its [3] Order, this Court reminded Plaintiff "that she was recently cautioned that she could be sanctioned for filing repetitive, frivolous lawsuits, and this Court will not hesitate to institute sanctions if it finds that Plaintiff has abused process by filing the present lawsuit." (*See id.* at 3). Plaintiff failed to heed this warning, and, thus, the Court now finds that sanctions against her are appropriate. Specifically, the Court will order that Plaintiff is barred from filing an *pro se* complaint in this court without first obtaining leave of court to do so. *See, e.g., Tribbit v. Ward*, 81 F.3d 156, 156 (5th Cir. 1996).

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED AND ADJUDGED that this action is **DISMISSED**.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED AND ADJUDGED that Plaintiff Madie Ruth Jackson may not file any additional *pro se* complaints without first obtaining leave of Court to do so. The Clerk of this Court is directed to return to Jackson, unfiled, any attempted submission inconsistent with this bar. *See Tribbit*, 81 F.3d at 156.

The Clerk is **ORDERED** to mail a copy of this Order to Plaintiff at the address provided.

SO ORDERED AND ADJUDGED this the 17th day of July, 2017.

s/ *Louis Guirola, Jr.*

LOUIS GUIROLA, JR.
CHIEF U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE